TRACT FOR AMERICANS.

FILLMORE'S POLITICAL HISTORY AND POSITION.

GEORGE LAW AND CHAUNCEY SHAFFER'S

REASONS FOR

REPUDIATING FILLMORE AND DONELSON,

And the Action of the Know-Nothing State Convention at Syracuse on the Resolutions censuring Brooks's Assault on Senator Sumner, &c.

SPEECH OF HON. E. B. MORGAN, OF N. Y.,

IN U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUG. 4, 1856.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. MORGAN said:

MR. CHAIRMAN: I propose to ask the attention of the House and of the country, to the probable consequences of the success of one of the candidates of the Presidency, who is a citizen of my own State, Hon. Millard Fillmore.

To exhibit them fully, it will be necessary to examine his antecedents, his personal relations to men and parties, the platform upon which he has consented to stand, the influences which prevailed in his nomination, the views and objects of those who support him, and the principles which must control him, if he is elected.

My sole object in referring to his personal antecedents and relations, is to throw light upon his probable line of policy, should he be elevated to the Presidential chair. I enter upon that branch of the discussion with sincere reluctance, and only because it is essential to a full elucidation of the subject.

Mr. Fillmore's Political History.

In 1829, Mr. Fillmore made his first entrance into public life, having been in that year elected to the New York Assembly, as an Anti-Mason. He was once or twice, re-elected to the New York Assembly as an Anti-Mason, and in 1832 was elected as such a member of this House. In the same year he voted for Mr. Wirt, the Anti-Masonic candidate for the Presidency.

He was afterwards a member of this House for a period of six years, commencing March 4, 1837, during which time he was attached to the Whig party. During this, his second period of service in Congress, the slavery agitation arose and was continued in the country, and the records, often quoted, and to which I shall now only briefly refer, show that Mr. Fillmore voted with persistent firmness on the side of freedom, and in company with such men as John Q. Adams, Joshua R. Giddings and Mr. Slade, of Vermont.

On the 21st day of December, 1837, Mr. Patton, of Virginia, offered the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That all petitions, memorials, and papers, touching the abolition of slavery, or the buying, selling, or transferring of slaves, in any State, District, or Territory of the United States, be laid on the table, without being debated, printed, read, or referred, and that no further action whatever shall be had thereon."

The resolution was adopted—yeas 122, nays 74; Mr. Fillmore voting in the negative.

☞ FOR SALE AT THE OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE. PRICE, PER DOZEN COPIES 20c.; PER HUNDRED, $1 25; PER THOUSAND, $10.

On the 11th of December, 1838, Mr. Atherton offered his celebrated resolutions in reference to Abolition petitioners, known in the politics of that time as "Atherton's gag." Mr. Fillmore voted against their introduction and against their adoption.

On the 13th of December of the same year, Mr. Wise, of Virginia, offered a series of resolutions declaring against the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, the abolition of the inter-State slave trade, and the reception of Abolition petitions—affirming that the laws of Congress alone govern in the prescription of the mode of recovery of fugitive slaves; that Congress has no power to impose the abolition of slavery upon a State as a condition of its admission into the Union; that the citizens of a slave State have a right to take their slaves through a free State; that the General Government is constitutionally bound to protect them in such right; that the laws of the non-slaveholding States in conflict with such right were null and void. The motion to suspend the rules for the introduction of these resolutions was lost—Mr. Fillmore voting adverse to the motion to suspend the rules, and against the South, and in company with Adams and Giddings.

On the same day, Mr. Slade of Vermont, moved resolutions against the slave trade between the District of Columbia and the States; against the same trade between the States? and in favor of receiving, debating, printing, and referring Abolition petitions. On the motion to suspend the rules for the purpose of introducing these resolutions, which was lost, Mr. Fillmore again voted against the South, in favor of suspending the rules, and in company with Adams and Giddings. On the 31st of December, 1839, Mr. Coles moved to suspend the rules, for the purpose of moving a resolution against the reception of Abolition petitions; which motion was lost; Mr. Fillmore voting against a suspension of the rules, and in company with Adams and Giddings.

On the 28th of January, 1840, the famous 21st rule was adopted, which precluded the reception or entertainment in any way of an abolition petition. On adopting this rule, Mr. Fillmore again voted against the South, in the negative.

On the 9th of December, 1840, Mr. Adams, of Massachusetts, moved a repeal of this last rule. Mr. Jenifer, of Maryland, moved to lay the motion on the table; which was carried; Mr. Fillmore voting in the negative, against the South.

On the 21st of January, 1841, Mr. Adams presented an abolition petition. Mr. Connor moved to lay a part of it, not embraced within the effect of the 21st rule, on the table. On the votes taken in reference to this petition, Mr. Fillmore's name is found with those of Adams and Giddings, and against the South.

On the 21st of January, 1842, Mr. Adams presented an abolition petition, praying the naturalization of free-negro foreigners, and that they be allowed to hold real estate. Mr. Wise moved to lay its reception on the table; which motion was carried. Mr. Fillmore again voted against the South, in the negative.

On the 12th of December, 1842, Mr. Adams called up his motion to rescind the 21st rule. Mr. Johnson, of Maryland, moved to lay it on the table; which motion was carried; Mr. Fillmore again voting against the South, in the negative.

On the 3d of January, 1843, Mr. Morgan moved a resolution instructing the Committee on Territories to bring in a bill repealing a certain act of the territorial legislature of Florida, preventing the immigration of free negroes into that Territory. Mr. Black moved to lay the resolution on the table; which was carried; Mr. Fillmore again voting against the South, in the negative.

These notes, covering every year of his Congressional service after the slavery agitation commenced, and with which all his votes harmonize, show plainly enough where Mr. Fillmore stood at that time.

In 1838, he wrote the following letter:

"BUFFALO, *Oct.* 17, 1838.

"SIR: Your communication of the 15th inst., as chairman of a committee appointed by the 'Anti-Slavery Society of the County of Erie,' has just come to hand. You solicit my answers to the following interrogatories:

"*First.* Do you believe that petitions to Congress on the subject of slavery or on the slave trade ought to be received, read, and respectfully considered by the Representatives of the people.

"*Second.* Are you opposed to the annexation of Texas to the Union, under any circumstances, so long as slaves are held therein?

"*Third.* Are you in favor of Congress exerting all the constitutional power it possesses to abolish the internal slave trade between the States?

"*Fourth.* Are you in favor of immediate legislation for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia?

"I am much engaged, and have no time to enter into an argument, or to explain at length my reasons for my opinion. I shall therefore content myself for the present by answering all your interrogatories in the affirmative, and leave for some future occasion a more extended discussion of the subject.

"I am, respectfully, your ob't servant,

"MILLARD FILLMORE."

W. Mills, Esq., Chairman.

In 1847, as a candidate for the Comptrollership, he was the head of the New York State Whig ticket, which was run upon a platform, which proclaims "since the crisis has arrived when the question must be met, uncompromising hostility to the extension of slavery into any territory now free, or which may hereafter be acquired by any action of the government of our Union."

In 1848, we find him instigating Hon. N. K. Hall, his law partner and special political friend, afterwards his Postmaster-General, to move a resolution here, which has more practical abolitionism in it than any proposition ever agitated in Congress. The resolution I am about to read, was prepared by Mr. Hall in concert with Mr. Fillmore, and was fully approved by Mr. Fillmore.

[Congressional Globe, Volume 18, p. 390.]

On the 28th of February, 1848, Hon. N. K. Hall, of New York, offered the following resolution in the House:

"*Resolved*. That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and they are hereby, directed to report to this House, with all convenient speed, a bill repealing all laws of Congress, and abrogating, so far as they are operative or in force in the District of Columbia, all laws of the State of Maryland which authorize or require the courts, officers, or magistrates of the United States, or of the said District, within the District of Columbia, to issue process for arrest, or commit to the jail of the said District, any runaways or other slave or fugitive from service, or colored person claimed as such, except on due complaint and proof of, or on a conviction for, some crime or misdemeanor, the commission of which by any free white person would authorize in the same manner the arrest, commitment, and detention of such white person in like manner charged with or convicted thereof."

This resolution is preceded by an elaborate preamble, in which, among other things, it is declared that the use of the jails in the District of Columbia for the detention of fugitive slaves, is "*repugnant to the feelings of a large majority of the people of the United States.*"

In 1848, Mr. Fillmore was nominated and elected Vice-President on the same ticket with Gen. Taylor. The suggestion that he might receive this nomination, was a matter of consideration and discussion for some time before it was made, by Mr. Fillmore and his friends. As a question of personal interest, Mr. Fillmore hesitated and wavered in deciding whether to solicit this nomination, or to reserve himself as a candidate for the United States Senatorship. On one point, his mind was made up from first to last. He would not accept the Vice-Presidential nomination, if Mr. Clay was designated for the Presidency. He had early adopted the opinion that Mr. Clay was unpopular and unavailable. So thinking, he got up and managed a caucus of the New York members of Congress in 1839, at which a letter was agreed upon and signed, Mr. Mitchell only dissenting, advising the New York delegation in the Harrisburg Convention, to bring out Gen. Harrison, and not Mr. Clay, for the campaign of 1840. He retained the same opinion of Mr. Clay's unavailability in 1848, which was increased by his apprehensions that Mr. Clay's declarations in the meantime in reference to the slavery question, would make him fatally obnoxious to the free sentiment of the North. Mr. Fillmore doubted whether it would be possible to support even Gen. Taylor at the North, in consequence of the prevalence and warmth of these sentiments. His final conclusion, communicated at the last moment to his friends leaving for the Philadelphia Convention, was, absolutely to refuse the use of his name if Mr. Clay was nominated for the Presidency, and that he did not desire his name to be used, if the nomination fell upon Gen. Taylor.

In fact, he was nominated upon the ticket with General Taylor, and it is only necessary to observe that this was so done, for the sole purpose of conciliating anti-slavery support to the ticket. Mr. Fillmore was known throughout the country, as a decided anti-slavery man, and it was hoped and believed that his name would reconcile Northern voters to the support of General Taylor, and so the event proved.

The original draft of Mr. Fillmore's letter, accepting the nomination for the Vice-Presidency, was submitted to his friends, and under their advice, was not published, until certain extreme anti-slavery sentiments were stricken out, which, in their judgment, would have been fatal to the Whig party at the South.

After his elevation to the Vice-Presidency, Mr. Fillmore took a new departure in politics, and I propose to point out some of the circumstances which preceded and attended it.

In the year 1839, Mr. Seward being Governor of New York, a bill was passed by the Legislature of that State, creating the office of Vice-chancellor for Western New York. This office was given by Gov. Seward to Frederick Whittelsey of Rochester, the bill creating it having passed the Legislature with the general understanding that that appointment would be made under it. Before the final completion of these proceedings, Mr. Fillmore, then at Washington, wrote a letter to a distinguished gentleman at Albany, expressing his own wish for this appointment, if it could be given to him consistently with the arrangements of the Whig party. In reply, Mr. Weed apprised him of the circum-

stances attending the creation of the office. Mr. Fillmore, however, never forgave Gov. Seward for his failure to gratify him in this matter.

In reference to some of the appointments made by General Taylor for the State of New York, opposing recommendations were made by Gov. Seward and Mr. Fillmore. The latter gentleman complained, although really without cause, that he did not have that weight with General Taylor to which he was entitled. In the end, a coolness grew up between Gen. Taylor and Mr. Fillmore, which carried Mr. Fillmore by insensible degrees into the camp of their common enemies. Becoming more and more estranged from General Taylor, he joined himself to the opposition raised by the South and by the democratic party to General Taylor's territorial policy, and at length became a prominent and conspicuous member of the coterie of Union savers. Nor did he fail to take an early advantage of his new political connections, to gratify the views in respect to the distribution of office, disappointment in which was the sole cause of his opposition to the soldier and patriot then administering the government.

In a speech delivered in California in the fall of 1854, Mr. Foote of Mississippi lets us into some of these secret movements. After recapitulating the points of one of his speeches in the United States Senate, in which he had denounced the free-soil movements and nominations to office of General Taylor, Mr. Foote says:—

"I had not long taken my seat before Mr. Badger of North Carolina, one of the purest and most patriotic men that ever occupied a place in the national council, came to me and stated that Vice-President Fillmore, the then presiding officer of the Senate, had requested him to make known to me that he perfectly concurred in the views which I had just expressed, and that he would be pleased to have an interview with me on the subject in the official rooms of the Capitol, at the hour of nine o'clock on the next morning. I promised to attend upon him at the time and place specified. I did so.

"Without going into particulars at present, it is sufficient for me to say that I obtained by the direction of Mr. Fillmore from the hands of an accredited friend of his, a list of the nominees subject to the objection of being agitators on the question of slavery. *This whole catalogue of worthies was disposed of in the Senate*, in other words they were sacrificed to the peace of the country; save one or two, whose nominations remained to be acted upon on the last night of the session of Congress. They were disposed of by *Mr. Fillmore himself*, on the same night; for just before the clock struck twelve, this gentleman, being then President, *sent in a special message, withdrawing all the offensive nominations*, and substituting others in their stead."

From this period, Mr. Fillmore was against his old friends and his old principles. As President he acted with the South and with the Democrats. Whig members of Congress had no access to him, and no influence with him. It was at the end of his administration that honest John Davis of Massachusetts, with bowed head and desponding heart, made the memorable declaration that "*slavery rules everything.*" A distinguished member of this House from Maine, Mr. Washburn, has informed the public that Mr. Davis said to him, that he felt himself as much a stranger in the White House after the accession of Mr. Fillmore, as he did during the administration of Mr. Polk. What was true of Mr. Davis, the tried and trusted leader of the Whigs of Massachusetts, was true of all the Whigs of the North who held fast to old principles. Mr. Fillmore received his reward in the unanimous support of the South in the Whig convention of 1852. But between himself and the true Whigs of the North, he had, with his own hands, erected an impassable wall of separation.

No personal disappointments could justify Mr. Fillmore in forming his new alliances against Gen. Taylor, but in truth, nothing had occurred of which he had the least right to complain. Gen. Taylor was a just, upright and sagacious man. Instead of finding Mr. Fillmore an impartial counsellor, taking a broad view of things, he found him intent at all times on advancing his peculiar, personal interests. At the first interview between them in Washington, Mr. Fillmore demanded that his partner, Mr. Hall, should be appointed Governor of Minnesota, and that Mr. Foote, the editor of his paper, the Buffalo Commercial Advertiser, should be appointed Minister at Constantinople. Gen. Taylor could not but see, and he did see, that Mr. Fillmore was a mere office broker, for his particular friends, instead of being a reliable adviser for the general good of a common party. Again, at Erie, when Gen. Taylor was lying there sick, and so sick, that, to use his own expression, he "*could not tell night from day*," Mr. Fillmore came up from Buffalo, not to minister to him, not to comfort him, but to extort a promise from him, the performance of which he afterwards exacted, that his friend, Mr. Stuart, should be appointed Architect of public buildings. Gen. Taylor noted these and similar things, and often, before his death, spoke of them with grief and indignation.

I know that there are many Whigs at the North, who still hold in good faith to the old

principles of the Whig party of the North, who incline to support Mr. Fillmore. Let me warn such men, that the rancor of a renegade always surpasses the hostility of an original enemy, and that we have more to hope, (I speak now as an original Whig,) from Mr. Buchanan, than from Mr. Fillmore, who hates his old associates and his old principles, from the consciousness, which he cannot escape, that he has been false to both. Implacable enmity to all the true men of the North, and thorough devotion to the politicians of the South; these make up the personal relations, never again to be changed, of Mr. Fillmore.

The American Party Platform.

The present platform of the American party, adopted in February last, and upon which Mr. Fillmore now stands, is precisely the same as the Cincinnati platform, so far as the Kansas-Nebraska policy is concerned. This is clear from its language, and equally so from its history.

The first platform of the American party, adopted in June, 1855, contained the celebrated "*Twelfth section*," now expunged, and which was as follows:

"XII. The American party having arisen upon the ruins, and in spite of the opposition, of the Whig and Democratic parties, cannot be in any manner responsible for the obnoxious acts or violated pledges of either. And the systematic agitation of the slavery question by those parties having elevated sectional hostility into a positive element of political power, and brought our institutions into peril, it has, therefore, become the imperative duty of the American party to interpose for the purpose of giving peace to the country and perpetuity to the Union. And, as experience has shown it impossible to reconcile opinions so extreme as those which separate the disputants, and as there can be no dishonor in submitting to the laws, the National Council has deemed it the best guarantee of common justice and of future peace, to abide by and maintain the existing laws upon the subject of slavery as a final and conclusive settlement of that subject, in spirit and in substance.

"And regarding it the highest duty to avow their opinions upon a subject so important in distinct and unequivocal terms, it is hereby declared, as the sense of this National Council, that Congress possesses no power under the Constitution to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the States where it does or may exist, or to exclude any State from admission into the Union because its Constitution does or does not recognize the institution of slavery as a part of its social system; and expressly pretermitting any expression of opinion upon the power of Congress to establish or prohibit slavery in any Territory, it is the sense of the National Council that Congress ought not to legislate upon the subject of slavery within the Territories of the United States, and that any interference by Congress with slavery as it exists in the District of Columbia would be a violation of the spirit and intention of the compact by which the State of Maryland ceded the District to the United States, and a breach of the national faith."

Here was no approval of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. On the contrary, the reference to "obnoxious acts" and "violated pledges," was intended, either to condemn it, or to carry the appearance of condemning it. But in respect to all present and future action, which is its only practical aspect, this section sustains the Nebraska act as a thing settled and not to be disturbed.

This twelfth section offended the great body of the northern Americans, and at a separate convention holden at Cincinnati in the fall of 1855, in which this northern wing was largely represented, the following resolution was adopted:

"That the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was an infraction of the plighted faith of the nation, and that it should be restored; and if efforts to that end should fail, Congress should refuse to admit into the Union any State tolerating slavery, which shall be formed out of any portion of the Territory from which that institution was excluded by that compromise."

This was the most moderate form to which the demands of the northern Americans could then be reduced.

In February last, the party met again in national convention, and having set aside the platform of June, 1855, adopted a new one, of which the two following are the only clauses which relate to the Nebraska controversy:

"*Seventh.* The recognition of the right of the native-born and naturalized citizens of the United States permanently residing in any Territory thereof, to frame their constitution and laws, and to regulate their domestic and social affairs in their own mode, subject only to the provisions of the Federal Constitution, with the right of admission into the Union whenever they have the requisite population for one Representative in Congress."

"*Thirteenth.* Opposition to the reckless and unwise policy of the present Administration, in the general management of our national affairs, and more especially as shown in

'removing Americans' (by designation) and conservatives in principle from office, and placing foreigners and ultraists in their places; as shown in a truckling subserviency to the stronger, and an insolent and cowardly bravado towards the weaker powers; as shown in reopening sectional agitation, by the repeal of the Missouri compromise," &c.

As to the past, this new platform differs from the old platform, inasmuch as it expressly condemns the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, whereas the old one does so only by inference and construction, if it does so at all.

As to the present and future, the two platforms are identical, both upholding the Nebraska policy of Judge Douglass, and both repudiating Congressional control over the Territories, under pretence of giving to the citizens thereof the right to govern themselves.

Practically, it is of no moment, what individuals, or parties, think of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. The important question is, what shall now be done? Shall the Douglass swindle be acquiesced in, or shall the Compromise be restored, in letter or substance? But while this is the only practical question, I must take occasion to say that I find it easier to respect those who sustain the Douglass policy, as right in principle, than those who condemn it, and at the same time sustain it.

The Northern members of the February Convention, saw at once that this new platform was as complete a repudiation of their views as the old one.

A resolution was offered by one of them that "*we will nominate no candidate for President or Vice President, who is not in favor of interdicting the introduction of slavery north of* 36° 30'."

A motion was made to lay this resolution on the table, and it was carried—yeas 141, nays 59.

The resolution to proceed to a ballot having passed, the Convention was about to do so, when Mr. Perkins of Connecticut, announced the secession from the Convention of the delegates of that State, which was followed by Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Ohio, and portions of the delegates of Illinois, Iowa, and Pennsylvania.

These seceding members put forth an address to the public, of which the following is the material portion:

"The undersigned, delegates to the Nominating Convention now in session at Philadelphia, find themselves compelled to dissent from the principles avowed by that body; and holding the opinion, as they do, that the restoration of the Missouri Compromise, demanded by a majority of the whole people, is a redress of an undeniable wrong, and the restoration of it, in spirit at least, indispensable to the repose of the country, they have regarded the refusal of that Convention to recognize the well defined opinion of the country, and of the Americans of the free States, upon this question, as a denial of their rights, and a rebuke to their sentiments.

Many Northern members having left the Convention upon these grounds, Mr. Fillmore obtained the nomination, receiving the Southern votes, with the exception of a few given to Garret Davis, of Ky., and General Houston. 14 of the 15 delegates from Virginia voted for Mr. Fillmore, and so did unanimously the delegations from Maryland, Delaware, North Carolina, Missouri, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, and Mississippi. And thus the South obtained the platform it wanted, and the man of its choice.

This thing was and is understood by the Southern members of that Convention, precisely as it was by the Northern members. The South came off the substantial winner, although, for theatrical effect, it was thought best to shed a few tears over the departed "*twelfth section.*"

Mr. Zollicoffer, a member of this House, from Tennessee, was a member of that Convention, and he has told us here, exactly what the true scope of the new platform is. I will quote from his reported speech.

In the House on the 3rd of April, 1856, [Appendix to Cong. Globe, 1st session, 34th Cong. page 355,]

Mr. Zollicoffer said:

"My colleague makes the point against me, that the thirteenth section embraces a specification against the Administration, for 'reopening sectional agitation by a repeal of the Missouri Compromise.' I will inform my colleague that I proposed to strike out that specification, and every specification in the thirteenth section; but there being much disorder at the time, I failed to succeed. * * * The question was subsequently about being put in the American council,—shall the new platform be adopted in lieu of the old? when some member proposed a division of the question, which was agreed to, and the vote was first taken upon *striking out* the old platform, I voted *against* striking out, but the proposition was carried. Then the question recurred upon adoption of the *new* platform. I voted *for its adoption.* I did it just as I voted for the Kansas-Nebraska bill in 1854, with some minor objections, which I stated at the time. * * * But to make the most of that specification in the platform, it is but an expression of opinion as to a *bygone* ism, while the seventh section of the platform lays down a vital prin-

ciple of action for the *present and the future*, covering the whole ground, and REASSERTING THE LEADING PRINCIPLE EMBODIED BOTH IN THE OLD TWELFTH SECTION AND IN THE NEBRASKA ACT."

Thus it is clear, that the American platform, for all substantial purposes, is identical with the Cincinnati platform.

To the same effect, another Fillmore member of this House, Hon. Charles Ready of Tennessee, in a recent letter to his constituents, says:

"It is true, Mr. Fillmore was opposed to the repeal of the Missouri restriction; and some, it may be many, of his supporters, were also opposed to it. Therein, there was a difference of opinion between us.

"But all those things are past. We must now look to the future. Will there, in the future, be an issue between us? Is Mr. Fillmore now, and will he hereafter be, in favor of restoring the Missouri restriction? *He is known to be opposed to all agitation on the subject of slavery*, AND TO STAND BY THE EXISTING LAWS. Then, there is no practical issue between us upon this point, nor is there between him and Mr. Buchanan. He also holds to the right of the Territory to admission into the Union, with a constitution prohibiting or establishing Slavery, as the people may therein provide. In this, we also agree with each other, and with Mr. Buchanan. Surely, then, I can support him without any inconsistency or change of political opinion."

Mr. Fillmore's Position.

Mr. Fillmore *talks*, just as his platform *reads*. Following that lead, he condemns the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and he says that he was opposed to it *when it was done*. I believe this to be an after thought. Not one word, not one line, was given to the public by Mr. Fillmore in 1854, against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. He was then making a tour through the South, delivering speeches, and whining about the "Union," just as he is now. Not a lisp did he utter against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, until the cue was given him in this platform. Following the same cue, he avoids saying any thing *about restoring the Compromise*.

Not only does Mr. Fillmore thus adopt a platform, in no respect better than the one which is sinking Mr. Buchanan, beyond the reach of the plummet, but he himself superadds to it, nullification, disunion and treason. This is strong language, but it is borne out by the truth. Mr. Fillmore does not merely predict disunion, but he incites and approves it. He does not merely say that the South will dissolve the Union if Col. Fremont is elected, but that they ought to dissolve it, and would be doing no more than the North would do under similar circumstances.

At Albany, June the 26th, Mr. Fillmore said:—

"We see a political party presenting candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, selected for the first time from the free States alone, with the avowed purpose of electing these candidates by suffrages of one part of the Union only, to rule over the whole United States. Can it be possible that those who are engaged in such a measure can have seriously reflected upon the consequences which must inevitably follow, in case of success? [Cheers.] Can they have the madness or the folly to believe that our southern brethren would submit to be governed by such a Chief Magistrate? [Cheers.] Suppose that the South having a majority of the electoral votes, should declare that they would only have slave-holders for President and Vice President; and should elect such by their exclusive suffrages to rule over us at the North; do you think we would submit to it? No, not for a moment. [Applause.] And do you believe that your southern brethren are less sensitive on this subject than you are, or less jealous of their rights?"

Certainly, Mr. Fillmore advances rapidly. In 1848, an abolitionist; in 1850, a Union man; in 1856, a Nullifier. What next?

Who will support and control Mr. Fillmore?

By no possibility can Mr Fillmore get a northern vote in the electoral colleges. In all probability, he can get none anywhere. If, however, the election is accidentally thrown into this House, not a solitary northern State is in his favor, as represented here. In any wise, his whole strength is at the South. His party is there. The control of it lies there. The northern Americans are mere bobs to a southern kite, just as the northern Democrats are. The only question between the Buchanan and Fillmore parties is, which of two parties, both intensely and exclusively southern, shall vault into power.

Now, I assert here, that the thirty Fillmore members of this House from the South, are even more rapidly and furiously pro-slavery than the Democrats from the South are. They united in the attempt to make Governor Aiken, with his fifteen hundred slaves, Speaker. They resisted, to a man, the investigation into the Kansas outrages, and to a man, they resist every measure of redress. To a man, they voted against the restoration of the Missouri compromise, as provided in Mr. Dunn's bill.

To a man, they voted to keep General Whitfield, the bogus Delegate from Kansas, in his seat. On everything, bearing directly or indirectly upon slavery, they vote to a man. They did so on the contested seat between Messrs. Allen and Archer, of Illinois.

They threaten disunion if the Missouri restriction is restored. On the 20th of last December, (Appendix to Congressional Globe, page 30,) Mr. Cox, of Kentucky, said:—

"When you tell me that you intend to put a restriction on the Territories, I say to you, that upon that subject the South is a unit, and will not submit to any such thing."

On the 19th of last December, (Appendix to Congressional Globe, page 56,) Mr. Campbell, of Kentucky said:—

"It is an interference with our institutions when our citizens are denied the same rights in the new territories with the citizens from the North, for that territory belongs to us as much as it does to you. * * * *

"Whenever this Government makes a distinction between a southern and northern constituency or citizenship, then we shall no longer consider ourselves bound to support the Confederacy, but will resort to the right of revolution, which is recognized by all."

The, following is one of the resolutions of the last American State convention in Alabama:—

"*Resolved*, That in view of the increased dangers that threaten the institutions of the South, this convention deems it necessary to, and does hereby, reindorse and adopt the following resolution, known as the Georgia platform, to wit: That the State of Alabama, in the judgment of this convention, will and ought to resist, (as a last resort,) to a disruption of every tie which binds her to the Union, any action of Congress upon the subject of slavery in the District of Columbia, or in places subject to the jurisdiction of Congress, incompatible with the safety, the domestic tranquillity, the rights and honor of the slaveholding States; or any act suppressing the slave trade between the slaveholding States; or any refusal to admit as a State any territory applying, because of the existence of slavery therein; or any act prohibiting the introduction of slaves into the territories; or any act repealing, or materially modifying, the laws now in force for the recovery of fugitive slaves."

It is useless to multiply quotations further. The whole thing is stated with exactness and truth in a letter addressed, on the 2d inst., to citizens of New Jersey, by a member of this House, [Mr. Watkins, of Tennessee,] himself elected as an American to his seat here:—

"Taking the record of this Congress in the various tests that have been applied and the relative position and votes of the three parties, I am forced to the conclusion, by every principle of reason, policy, and philosophy, that the South Americans must and will, ultimately unite with the Democratic party, and those who claim to be Americans North with the republican party."

And again, in the same letter, Mr. Watkins says:—

"The interests, sympathies, and legitimate and proper identity of the South Americans are with the national democratic party of the country."

Undoubtedly this is so, and to sincere men, holding sincere opinions upon the great question of slavery extension, it must be apparent, that as affecting the result, the election of Mr. Fillmore will be precisely the same as the election of Mr. Buchanan. They are both southern candidates, having their strength at the South, and certain to be controlled by the South, if elected. I am aware, as I have said once before, that many persons at the North, honestly opposed to the extension of slavery, are still inclined to Mr. Fillmore, from a misapprehension of his true position. To such men I have particularly designed to address myself. Can they believe, upon a fair review of the whole case, that freedom has anything to hope from the success of Mr. Fillmore?

We are upon the eve, sir, of important political movements, and I intend to speak plainly. It is fast becoming apparent that Mr. Fillmore has no effective strength and can carry no single State. His friends still cling to Maryland as a forlorn hope, but they must soon abandon even that State. If Mr. Fillmore is not formally withdrawn, he will be substantially dropped. The bulk of his present supporters at the North will, in that event, rally under the broad banner of Fremont and Freedom. Not so, I fear, with Mr. Fillmore himself and his immediate advisers. It is my most deliberate judgment that they prefer Mr. Buchanan to Col. Fremont, and that they will keep Mr. Fillmore in the field, or withdraw him, just as may be thought best for the interests of the democratic party. In my opinion, there is not in all the Northern States a man more completely and irretrievably wedded to the South, by his sympathies on the one hand and his hatreds on the other, than Mr. Fillmore. Since 1850, he has been with the South and with the democratic party, and he will never return to the friends whom

he has betrayed. They expect nothing from him but implacable hostility to the last.

But to the great body of his present supporters at the North, I appeal with confidence. Come over to your natural allies. Unite the North and thereby tranquilize the Union. In the presence of an united and irresistible North, the madness of Southern nullification would be arrested. Men of all parties of the South are rushing to the support of Mr. Buchanan, as the pledged representative of Southern sectional interests. Has freedom less power than slavery, to produce concert, and arouse sympathies?

The support of Mr. Fillmore at the South, at this moment, is a mere sham to keep alive a Fillmore party at the North, so as to defeat the election of Col. Fremont. Will the intelligent people of the North be longer deceived?

Mr. Fillmore has delivered many speeches since his return from Europe, but in not one of them has he expressed either sympathy for the down-trodden people of Kansas, or indignation against those who have oppressed them. He has proposed no measure of redress for their wrongs, and he has offered co-operation in no such measure. For the cause of liberty, so fearfully imperiled by the wants in Kansas, he has uttered no word of cheer, or counsel, or hope. He has been as silent and as cold as the grave, upon a theme which has stirred the freemen of this country, as they have not been stirred since the days of the Revolution. He has eyes and ears for nothing but the Presidency, and that to be reached by the support of the South. He has no voice, and no heart, for the North which he has abandoned.

And for what cause, and on what pretence, is the North to be persuaded to divide its strength at this crisis? For an issue and a question, which, in all its political aspects, has been abandoned by his friends upon the floor of this House. A session of Congress of nearly nine months is near its termination, and no friend of Mr. Fillmore here has moved any change in the Naturalization laws, a change in which is the only substantial object proposed by the American organization. The thirty Southern friends of Mr. Fillmore have been active enough and zealous enough, whenever or wherever the interests of slavery have been concerned. Not one thought, or one moment, have they given to this pretended issue of Americanism, with which they hope to divide the North and secure to themselves the control of this continent forever. Is it possible that the intelligence of the free States will be deceived by pretences so flimsy?

Who has forgotten the declaration made on this floor, during the contest for the Speakership, by Hon. Humphrey Marshall, of Kentucky, the bold and frank leader of Mr. Fillmore's thirty Southern members of this House? "*I will* FIRST *take care of the niggers, and then take care of the Irish and Dutch!*" This was the out-spoken declaration of Mr. Marshall. Slavery first, and Americanism afterwards; this is the motto and the practice of the South. Slavery swallows up everything else, and controls everything else.

And who is running for the Vice-Presidency on the same ticket with Mr. Fillmore? Mr. Donelson, of Tennessee, who, on the day of his nomination, boasted of his one hundred negroes, as the proof and guarantee of his fidelity to the "*institutions*" of the South! The ticket presented to us is not Fillmore alone, bad as that would be, but Fillmore *and* Donelson, "niggers" and all.

The Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, urging the claims of Mr. Fillmore upon the South, makes the following statement as to the sentiments which he expressed during the Southern tour of 1854:

"Having made the tour of the Southwestern Slave States, he announced on the steps of the State House door in Montgomery, that *the anti-Slavery prejudices of his early education had been obliterated by what he had seen in the South of the happy condition of the slave.*"

Of the fact that Mr. Fillmore's original opinions or "*anti-Slavery prejudices*" have been thoroughly "*obliterated*" there can be no question, but the *date* and *cause* of the obliteration are not correctly given in this extract. It was not the Southern tour of 1854, but the Washington intrigues of 1850, which did the work. It was not what Mr. Fillmore saw of "*the happy condition of the slaves*" at the South, but what he had seen of "*the happy condition*" of politicians at this seat of power, attaining fortune and prosperity by subserviency to the interests of slavery. It was this spectacle of what has been, but may not always continue, which "*obliterated*" every single free principle of Mr. Fillmore's youth and manhood.

LETTER FROM GEORGE LAW ON THE POLITICAL CRISIS.

NEW YORK, *July* 8, 1856.

DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 26th ult. I have carefully reflected upon its contents. In reply, I beg to state to you that I deeply regret no more perfect union has been effected by those whose duty it was to have accomplished that object—to unite the whole elements of opposition to the present corrupt administration, wielded as it is by the extreme slave oligarchy of the South. For the last three years, this same oligarchy has used the entire power and patronage of the General Government to crush out all independent action and honest representation on the part of the North, to purchase up Northern men who were willing to misrepresent their constituents from personal motives, and for promises of favor from the present corrupt administration.

All good men who have the love of their country at heart, both in the North and in the South, should unite cordially in a common effort to destroy the viper that has coiled around the freedom and independence of the American people. Freedom of speech is prohibited in the halls of Congress: bowie-knives and revolvers are worn as daily appendages at the Capitol as a means of assault and defence. The Senate declares itself not only powerless for punishment, but even palsied for protection. Its members look quietly on and see a member stricken down in open day in the Senate chamber, without even the common effort of humanity that would be exercised in a bar-room to save a man prostrated, without an opportunity of defending himself. Thus you see that those who represent their constituents honestly, and by unanswerable arguments, and who cannot be purchased by Executive favor, must be awed into silence by bowie-knives, bludgeons, and revolvers. Such is the scheme of Government inaugurated under the Pierce dynasty, and fostered by the Southern sectional power that supports it. Upon this basis, and into the arms of this power, the nominee of the Cincinnati Convention surrenders himself before the country, without the slightest reservation or individual independence of his own. What has the country to expect if Mr. Buchanan succeeds? Nothing better than what it has experienced under Mr. Pierce, and perhaps something worse. One is an old man without independence of mind, or energy of character, which the country is forewarned of by his declaration, that he is no longer James Buchanan, and has no views or opinions of his own, and is therefore the pliant instrument of the Slave power that nominated him at Cincinnati, and must reflect their views only. It will be well for the American people to remember this when they cast their vote for chief magistrate in November next.

The other came into office, a man in the prime of life, without any such submission or pledges, backed up by almost the unanimous voice of the country in his election, and yet he was not three weeks in office before he surrendered himself to the same oligarchy that has wielded his power during his administration, as absolutely as if he had no will or mind of his own, and had no responsibility to any section of the Union except to the 350,000 slaveholders of the South, who now control the Executive, the Judiciary, and the Senate. The only voice the Free States have in the Federal Government is in the House of Representatives.

Is it not fair to expect that if Mr. Buchanan should be elected, the evils that the country has experienced for the last three years will go on increasing during his administration until the Northern mind will submit no longer to be cheated, bullied, defied, and deprived of its just rights and fair representations in the Federal Government.

As one of the leading features of the coming administration, slavery is to be forced into Kansas. The rivers, the great highway of the nation through Missouri, a Slave State, are to be closed, as they are at present, to the freemen of the North who desire to emigrate to that territory. Those great thoroughfares which have heretofore been looked upon as the pride of the nation, and that steam has rendered so valuable for the transportation of persons or property, must be closed to the freemen of the North, or they must be subjected to examination, insult, loss of property, and turned back, unless they proclaim themselves in favor of the institution of slavery in this territory. Such means as these are made use of to force slavery into Kansas. When free emigrants arrive there, after all these difficulties and delays have been surmounted, they must undergo another examination, and swear allegiance to the government of the slave power organized in Kansas by the Missouri mob, or be deprived of the right of franchise and of holding office. This is the operation of squatter sovereignty, which deprives a man of his citizenship, unless he swears fidelity to slavery; and all this is to be carried out and put in execution by an armed force, furnished from Missouri—the adjoining Slave State; and the Federal Government, with Federal troops in the Territory, will look on calmly without interfering, so long as the Missouri mob succeeds to enforce slavery upon Kansas; but if the men from the Free States, who believe in free speech, free territory, free labor, free press, and free men, should be too numerous for the slave labor, then the Federal troops organized for this special purpose, under the command of a Southern favorite of a Southern secessionist Secretary of War, are to interfere and decide the contest in favor of Slavery in Kansas. So much for the chances of Northern principles and Northern men in Kansas, and all that vast territory North of 36° 30′, secured to freedom by solemn compact, in which the great minds of the country united to build up and preserve to freedom, and which the pigmies and traitors, aided by this corrupt administration, have attempted to pull down and destroy. Here is where Gen. Pierce stands, and here is where

James Buchanan stands, while asking for the support of the freemen of the North.

A few words about Mr. Fillmore. Let us examine with what consistency we, as Americans, or Northern freemen, can support him. What are his antecedents? When President of the United States, was he not entirely subservient to the Slave Power? Did he resist the overtures of the Slave Obligarchy of the South, or did he become a willing instrument in their hands? I ask you to look at his acts while President, and let them be the answers to these questions. I will refer you to the Fugitive Slave Law, that makes the freemen of the North slave catchers—that refuses to them the right of trial by jury—that centres the right of freedom of the man in one judge, and pays him a double fee if he declares him a slave, and only half the fee if he finds him a freeman. This is the power that the slave oligarchy of the South exercise at the North, where we have prohibited property in men to our own citizens; and this act bears the signature of Millard Fillmore as President of the United States. I ask you how he can expect the vote of the free North. Can you give him your vote? Can I give him mine? Are these the views you and I entertain in relation to the rights and the duty of the people of the North or mankind? Now, sir, upon this question alone, without going into all his other acts of subserviency to the South and the slave power, let him stand for the suffrages of the freemen of the North.

As to the Americanism of Mr. Fillmore, you and I have some knowledge of how much he has done to sustain that party. Has he ever been identified with it either in principle or in feeling? If so, where are his acts—on what occasion heretofore has he proclaimed it? What assistance has he ever rendered us in all our contests? What were his antecedents to Americanism when President of the United States? Did he then protect American interests or American men? I well recollect that he did not, and the country will recollect it too.

When the Captain-General of Cuba issued his decree prohibiting the steamship Crescent City from touching at Havana so long as Mr. Smith, an American citizen, was aboard of her as Purser, because, as they alleged, the *Herald* and other papers in New York had published some information from Havana that was distasteful to the Cuban Government, and which they charged to have been furnished by Purser Smith, and, therefore, neither the Crescent City nor any other American ship should be allowed to touch at Havana having Mr. Smith on board, or any other person who would dare to furnish to the American press information disagreeable to the Captain-General of Cuba—Mr. Fillmore was apprised of this order by the owners of the Crescent City, and he was desired to take some action in relation to it for protection of American property and American citizens; he miserably skulked the responsibility of his position, and used his interest with the owners to have Mr. Smith dismissed as purser, and to be replaced by some one who was satisfactory to the Captain-General of Cuba.

This the owners refused to do, and sent Mr. Smith back in the ship. Mr. Fillmore ordered the United States mails to be taken from the vessel, and notified the owners that if the ship was fired upon by the Cuban authorities, and damaged or destroyed, that they would have no claim upon this Government for remuneration. The commander of the Crescent City was removed by his order, he being an officer of the United States Navy, and under the President's control. Another commander was appointed by the owners. He, too, was removed by Mr. Fillmore's orders. The ship was fined $4,000 for not carrying the United States mails, when the United States Government or Mr. Fillmore withheld them. The insurance offices in New-York were either frightened by the course of Mr. Fillmore, or influenced by him to withhold their insurance from property shipped by the steamer that Purser Smith was on board of. The owners of the Crescent City had to insure the property of the shippers. The passengers on board of her were not allowed to be landed in Cuba. The owners persevered in what they considered their proper rights, and the rights of an American citizen, and refused to dismiss Purser Smith, until the Captain-General of Cuba was obliged to rescind the mandate against Purser Smith. This is the mode in which the rights of an American citizen had to be vindicated while Mr. Fillmore was President. This is the same Mr. Fillmore that you recommend me to support as an American. Now, sir, can you support him as an American? Can the American Party support him as an American? Is he the proper representative of the American people? These are facts for the American people to look at before they vote. For my part, Mr. Fillmore would be the last man I would support in the whole country as the standard bearer of the great American Party.

What has Mr. Fillmore ever done for this country or the American Party? Where are his acts that are to be remembered or treasured up in the hearts of the people? What great interests has he ever advanced? Or has he been a mere office-holder, without merit, except the merit of doing nothing?

You are aware of the manner in which he was forced upon the American party by the Slave Oligarchy at Philadelphia, when he apparently received the nomination of the Convention.

In the letter to me you appear to lay great stress upon the course that the Republican party has seen fit to pursue, and that it has not met the American party half way in the great work of uniting the whole North against the corrupt policy of the present Administration and the power that controls the Cincinnati nominee. We will suppose that all this is true in relation to the Republican party. I myself do not think the Republican Convention acted as wisely as it might have done, when the object was harmony of action to accomplish a great good for the whole country; but is this any reason why I should be diverted from the great purpose I have at heart, which is to unite all parties that think as I do in relation to the corrupt policy of the present Administration, and the continuation of that policy if Mr. Buchanan should be elected? No man, or set of men, whatever their conduct may be, shall divert me for one

moment from the course I have marked out in the coming Presidential campaign.

I intend to go for the man who most nearly represents the American sentiment, and the sentiment in relation to Slavery of the freemen of the North, which declares that Slavery is sectional and that Freedom is national. At the same time I desire to have the best representative of the progress of the age in which we live. I want a man who has done something for the great material interests of the country. I want to see his footprints, not promised, but already made in the direction that has led to the development of the resources of our country—who has enlarged the field upon which the labor and intelligence of our country is to be applied—one who has done something for American interests and American rights—one who has done something forthe area of freedom—something for material progress and benefit to his fellow men. I want no old politician, with his host of dependents as seedy as himself. Let us have a man in the prime of life, full of energy, and yet sufficiently familiar with the vicissitudes of life to judge of men correctly—to appreciate the wants of the whole country—to avoid the intrigues and traps of politicians—to devote himself honestly and fearlessly to the interests of the country—to apply the resources of the Government to the accomplishment of such improvements as are national in their character, and that will result in the greatest benefit to the whole country—one who has no old political friends to reward, and no old political enemies to punish—one who will feel that he is elevated by the people and not by intrigue. Now, Sir, of the candidates who are before the people for the exalted position of Chief Magistrate, I prefer JOHN C. FREMONT. I prefer him because he is not an old hackneyed politician, and all sold out. He is in the prime of life—43 years old. He has been brought into notice by the energy and exertion that he has evinced as a great explorer of the route to the Pacific Ocean. He first opened up the pathway through the wilderness that others followed to the golden fields of California, and gave the most accurate and extended view to the American people, of all that vast region of country between the borders of civilization on the Atlantic slope and the Pacific Ocean. He took an active part and was foremost in raising and sustaining the American flag in California. He commenced first and went all through the campaign with signal success, that ended in the acquisition of all that vast territory and wealth—that opened up to American enterprise and American energy such a field as has no parallel in history—which has advanced the country at least 25 years at a single bound. It gave us the facilities of increasing our commerce. It enabled us to extend largely our railways and other internal improvements, and thus has greatly increased our manufacturing and agricultural interests by enlarging the field of produce and consumption. It has added hundreds of millions to the capital of the nation. By his explorations he has opened up the most central and convenient railroad route to California. He aided in the organization of California as a State, and devoted her institutions to freedom, and she acknowledged her indebtedness to Fremont, by sending him as her first Senator to Congress. He protected American interests in California. He protected and advocated American interests in the Senate of the United States. His antecedents are American. He rose by his own energy, his own industry, and his own merit. These are antecedents that will be appreciated by the American people. They are not the promises of to-day of American principles under the expectation of the suffrages of the American party, but they are a history of his life from his youth upward, when actuated by no other motives than a true American heart, thoroughly devoted to the interests of his country.

With this view of the subject, who are we to support? I have fairly canvassed the different candidates. So far as Americanism is concerned, we may as well support Mr. Buchanan as Mr. Fillmore. He has a fairer American record than Mr. Fillmore; and, as for the promises of old politicians, we all know what they are worth on the eve of an election. I do not mean to be cheated by them, nor do I wish to see the American people, by pretensions that have no value, but that are entirely worthless.

In relation to the subject of the extension of Slavery, we may as well support Mr. Buchanan as Mr. Fillmore. Mr. Buchanan promises that he will be governed by the Southern slaveholders, and Mr. Fillmore we know has already been governed by them.

As to advancing the interests of the country, we may as well support Mr. Buchanan, as Mr. Fillmore. Neither of them has ever advanced, by any act of his own, the great industrial interests of the country. They have both been drones, living on office. The only difference that I see is, that Mr. Fillmore is about five years younger than Mr. Buchanan, and has that many chances less to die.

You would laugh and ridicule the idea if I were to ask you to vote for Mr. Buchanan as a proper representative of the American party; it seems to me equally ridiculous that you should ask me to vote for Mr. Fillmore as the American Candidate.

I shall give my support to John C. Fremont, as the best representative, in my estimation, of the American people and the American party.

I am, with much respect, yours truly,

GEORGE LAW.

To G. A. SCROGGS, Esq., Buffalo, N. Y.

CHAUNCEY SHAFFER, ESQ., RENOUNCING FILLMORE.

SARATOGA SPRINGS, *August* 14, 1856.

W. DUNN, ESQ.—*My Dear Sir:*

I have just received, by way of New-York city, your note of the 9th inst., enclosing the following extract from the Ithaca Citizen, to wit:

"COMING BACK.—Chauncey Shaffer, who was one of the most prominent bolters from the Philadelphia American Convention, and who has been stumping the river counties in this State at the Fremont meetings, has returned to the hearty support of Fillmore and Donelson. Mr. Shaffer is an eloquent speaker, and was District Attorney in New York city. He belongs to the Methodist church, and his recent conviction that Mr. Fremont is a Roman Catholic, is the reason why he withdraws his support from the Republicans. He has candidly examined all the evidences for and against, which have appeared, and he looked closely into the statements of Fulmer, and the opposition against them, and declares that the evidence in favor of his being a Papist is conclusive, for which reason he cannot support him."

You assure me that the above is producing an impression in your region, and desire me to inform you whether it is true or not. I answer that it is a sheer fabrication—a "Roorback." That no further mischief may occur from the circulation of that article, I will set the matter of my preference of candidates right at once.

In the first place, I was not a prominent or other "bolter from the Philadelphia American Convention." I was not a delegate to that Convention. There were reasons why I should not be a delegate. I had too much to do with undoing the work of a previous Council in Philadelphia assembled; too much to do against the slave propagandists at Binghamton last August, and was too little inclined to see Americanism sold out, to be considered a safe man to go to Philadelphia.

I staid at home against my will, I admit. Moreover, that Convention was not an "American Convention."

As far as the North was concerned, it was a Silver Grey Whig Convention; as far as the South was concerned, it was a Convention for the propagation of human slavery, and the result was the nomination of two men, one of whom glories in being the owner of a hundred slaves, and the other (Mr. Fillmore), in being a most subservient instrument of the slave power, as is manifestly proved by his course while acting as President of the United States; also, by his speeches made during his southern tour, in pursuit of a re-nomination, as well as by his nullification speeches at Albany and elsewhere, on his return from his visit to the Pope.

Hence the leading Silver Grey newspapers of the North (including the New York Express), claim Mr. Fillmore as the regular Whig nominee for the Presidency, while the South claim him as the champion of Southern rights (meaning the extension of human slavery by the action of the General Government), while Mr. Fillmore, to justify the claims of the South, in effect says, "Elect me, or the South, that loves me so well, shall not remain in the Union."

As an American, I am not bound by the action of that Convention; rather let me say, I cannot submit to be bound by its action, any more than can my brethren of Massachusetts or Connecticut, and of every New England State. The American party of Massachusetts, in solemn council assembled, has declared for Mr. Fremont, and nominated electors favorable to his election: and so has the State of Connecticut, and so will all New England do (for New England has a history), and so will the American party of this State act, excepting always a portion of the Silver Grey portion of that party. The latter portion will stand by Mr. Fillmore, notwithstanding he "has adopted the leading principles of that platform," the seventh section of which commits the American party to Slavery extension under the guise of squatter sovereignty; because this "portion of a portion" came into the order with the design of retrieving the fallen fortunes of Mr. Fillmore, as is proved by the attempted ostracism of the liberal-minded men of the order, and by the threats preceding and accompanying the Philadelphia Convention, that in the event of George Law's receiving the nomination for the Presidency, they with the Whig party proper, would nominate an out-and-out American Whig (meaning Mr. Fillmore, I presume), and also by letters now in existence, and which, I hope, will yet be published.

I have not "returned to the hearty support of Fillmore and Donelson," nor will I do any act or thing tending to sanction the outrages of pro-slavery, nullification border ruffians, who, in addition to their outrages in Missouri and Kansas, of themselves sufficient to turn the cheek of darkness pale, have from 1852 until now, wrested the high powers of the nation from their legitimate purpose, to the strengthening of the slave oligarchy.

There are other objections to my supporting Mr. Fillmore, founded upon the fact stated by the Citizen, that I belong to the Methodist Church.

The church owes slavery no particular good will; for slavery has rent that church in twain; has imprisoned women for teaching slaves to read the Bible, and has sought in every way to destroy that church, as being the opponent of slavery most to be feared. Let facts speak. Last winter a minister of the Methodist Church, in Missouri, was arrested while in the pulpit by a gang of men (who, if they live, will probably vote for Mr. Fillmore), who wantonly and falsely charged him with horse-stealing, and without allowing him time to put on his overcoat, mounted him on a horse, drove him some seventeen miles, (the weather being intensely cold,) threw him into a cheerless room, without fire, and there left him to die, *and there he died.*

My informant is a bishop of the Methodist Church, and spoke of his own knowledge.

Another instance: The Rev. Mr. Wiley, and about 30 other ministers of the Methodist Church, have been assaulted in their churches, and driven from place to place like wild beasts of prey, their lives being every day in imminent peril.

Another instance: In Kansas, a Methodist minister was whipped, tarred, and feathered, tied to a log, and set afloat on the Missouri river.

Another instance: Very recently, a Methodist minister in Missouri, while preaching was dragged from his pulpit and tarred and feathered; while an old Methodist layman for the crime of expostulation against such conduct, was shot; and it is a notorious fact, and one which will not admit of controversy, that a minister of my church cannot preach the gospel in the State of Missouri, or the Territory of Kansas, but at the peril of his life! And yet I find no reproof of these outrages either in the Philadelphia platform, or in any of the speeches of Mr. Fillmore.

As to my having examined "all the evidence" in relation to Mr. Fremont's religious creed, I have to say that I have examined all the evidence including Alderman Fulmer's statement, and have exhausted the means of information within my reach, and have arrived at the following conclusions:

1st. That Mr. Fremont's father was a French Huguenot, and his mother an American Protestant lady.

2d. That Col. Fremont was born a Protestant, and baptized a Protestant, married a Protestant lady, has had his children baptized by a Protestant clergyman, educates them in the Protestant faith, while he is a Protestant in practice in all the relations of life.

I admit that he was married by a Catholic clergyman, under circumstances peculiar to himself, and with which the public is already acquainted.

3d. I conclude that Alderman Fulmer's statement is altogether untrue. Col. Fremont was not in Washington at the time Fulmer says he conversed with him, nor within several months of that time. He was on the Pacific Ocean, or the Isthmus of Darien, or on the steamer George Law from Aspinwall to New York city, at the time fixed by Fulmer.

I should add that upon Col. Fremont's arrival in New-York city, he sailed to Europe without visiting Washington at all, and that he remained in Europe more than a year.

I should further add, that the conviction in my mind that Alderman Fulmer has borne false witness against his neighbor, is strengthened by the contradictory statements that I am credibly informed he has made concerning this pretended conversation, and by the further facts that amongst his immediate neighbors his statement is not believed.

But if I should refuse to vote for Mr. Fremont, because of his being a Roman Catholic, I could not vote for Mr. Fillmore; and for the reason that the Convention which nominated Mr. Fillmore was controlled by Roman Catholics as well as by slavery propagandists. This is the proof:

Two sets of delegates, appeared from the State of Louisiana, one Protestant, and the other Roman Catholic, both demanding admission. The Roman Catholic delegation was received, and the Protestant delegation was rejected. The reason, I understand, assigned for this singular admission and rejection was, that the Roman Catholic delegation did not acknowledge the temporal supremacy of the Pope—but did the Protestant delegation acknowledge the temporal supremacy of the Pope?

There are other objections to my supporting Mr. Fillmore, and as an American, and a man who at the commencement of his political life resolutely set his face against the further aggressions of the slave power, I cannot be induced by any special pleading or by any "Roorbacks" that may be hatched in the hotbed of political zeal, to vote for any other man for President than Col. Fremont, inasmuch as I see no other way of putting an end to the terrible aggressions of the slave power.

I believe upon the election or defeat of Col. Fremont, will depend the questions, whether or not the black column of slavery will be pushed to the Pacific ocean; whether or not the African slave trade, the sum of all wickedness, will be revived; and whether or not practical slavery shall be forced upon the Free States under the decisions of Federal judges, appointed as Mr. Fillmore sought to appoint and did appoint some of his judges; and in short, whether this country shall have a constitutional government for the slave oligarchy; whether or not we shall recover our lost national honor, and go on in peaceful progress to the climax of human greatness; whether we shall be destroyed by the aggressive system of the slave power.

Very truly yours,

CHAUNCEY SHAFFER.

THE SOUTH AMERICANS ON BORDER-RUFFIANISM.

Freedom of Speech Infamous.

THE Fillmore Americans held a State Convention at Syracuse on the 26th of August, which lasted two days. At this Convention, such delegates as were supposed to favor freedom in the Territories were excluded by the arbitrary dictum of the President of the Council. Nevertheless, a few delegates or Deputies, as they call them, escaped the vigilance of the President, and passed into the Hall. Among these was LUTHER CALDWELL, Esq., of Rockland County, who offered the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the attempts made in Congress during its late session, and particularly in the United States Senate, to suppress freedom of speech, as manifested in the brutal, clandestine and cowardly attack of Brooks upon Senator Sumner, deserve and should receive the execration of the people of the United States, and that all those, irrespective of party, who, by their votes in Congress or otherwise, have sustained Brooks in his infamous conduct, are justly obnoxious to the same reprobation,

Resolved, That the well-nigh fatal assault upon Freedom, in the outrages perpetrated in Kansas under the protection of the present National Administration, and the failure of Congress effectually to interpose and prevent those enormous aggressions upon the sovereignty of the actual inhabitants of that Territory, merit the unqualified condemnation of all lovers of republican liberty, and that no true American should be indifferent to the same, or fail, by word and act, in all fitting ways, to vindicate the oppressed against their oppression and oppressors.

Resolved, That the provisions of the Kansas-Nebraska act for the government of the Territories are fallacious in theory; and that this Convention deem it the duty of the American party in this State and Nation boldly to assert and firmly maintain the doctrine of our fathers, that the government of the Territories is vested in, and should be exercised by, Congress.

Resolved, That this Council denounces the repeal of the Missouri Compromise as destructive to the repose, harmony and fraternal relations of the country; and that the Territory which was covered by it must, and shall be preserved to Freedom, so that Slavery may not exist therein, nor Slave States, formed therefrom, be admitted into this Union.

This effort of Mr. Caldwell to bring the party up to the adoption of something like the Binghamton Platform, on which, a year before, they had gone before the people and succeeded in the election, utterly failed, when he and a few others, who sympathized with him, left the Convention and went over to the other American Convention, then in session at Collipean Hall, in the same city, where they were warmly received. Mr. Caldwell was invited to the stand, and related his experience among the South American conspirators against liberty, as follows:

These resolutions, Mr. C. said, he offered in that body, with the statement that he believed the American party in the State of New York to be Anti-Nebraska in sentiment, and that he wished to place it upon record that such is its position; that, in his view, the adoption of his resolutions would promote the success of the American ticket in the North—particularly in the States of New York, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania—while at present the party is daily losing ground in those States from the position in which it is placed before the people on the subject of slavery; that with these and such like arguments he urged their adoption; that the Council was thereby thrown into the wildest state of excitement; that scores of members flocked around him and besought him to withdraw the resolutions—some urging that if adopted, the South would be driven from the support of Fillmore, and for this reason, that however truly they embodied the views of the party in New York, it would not do to set them forth. Moreover, that their adoption would repel from them the Administration-Nebraska voters, whom they were expecting would support Fillmore in the State of New York; and more seriously still, that their rejection, should they be offered, would drive from the support of Fillmore thousands of Anti-Nebraska voters, now acting with the party in this State; that by such considerations they had sought to influence him, but failing, President Sammons summarily ended the difficulty by declaring the resolutions out of order; that he thereupon appealed from that decision, but President Sammons was sustained by the Council, which thus rejected the resolutions; that he then returned to President Sammons his commission as Deputy for Rockland County, withdrew from all connection with that organization, and retired.

The statement of Mr. Caldwell was listened to with the profoundest interest, and a touching and eloquent address made by him, upon the principles of the North Americans, and expressive of his sympathy with and determination henceforward actively to support them, was greeted with rounds of applause.

The resolutions of Mr. Caldwell were immediately adopted by the North Americans unanimously, together with the following:

Resolved, That the State Council now in session in this city is repudiated by this body: that its unconstitutional and illegal action has freed Americans from all obligation of allegiance to it or its decrees, and that this body is the true American organization of the State of New York.

Resolved, That the nominations of Fillmore and Donelson be and the same are hereby repudiated by this body.

Resolved, That John Charles Fremont, the nominee for the Presidency of the American National Convention, held in the City of New York, June 12, standing upon the positions of the Binghamton platform, as the opponent of the present National

Administration, and as opposed to Slavery extension, be and he is hereby adopted as the candidate of true Americans of the State of New York.

Resolved, That the State Committee be recommended to call a State Nominating Convention, to consist of two Delegates from each Assembly District, to meet in the city of Syracuse, Sept. 17, at 12 o'clock noon.

Subsequently, the Piermont Council, of which Mr. Caldwell was a member, expelled that gentleman, and branded him *infamous* as follows:

Whereas, At a Convention of the American party, held at Syracuse, in this State, on the 24th day of August last, Luther Caldwell, Deputy for Rockland County, did present, without the authority of this party, and in direct and willful violation of its principles, a series of resolutions opposed to its Presidential nominees and the platform on which they stand:

Resolved, That Luther Caldwell, by his treachery to his party, has rendered himself wholly unworthy of confidence as a politician, and *respect as a citizen:* and has shown himself to be a man utterly devoid of integrity and manly principle.

Resolved, That this council unequivocally approves the action and endorses the proceedings of the late State Council at Syracuse, in rejecting all matters foreign to the issue of the American party.

Resolved, That this Council (the members being largely in attendance,) does hereby heartily expel the said Luther Caldwell from the said Council, and thus justly *brands him with infamy*, and that we hold him in contempt as a *traitor to his party and his country.*

In estimating the extent of Mr. Caldwell's Infamy and Treason, we beg the reader to refer to the resolutions which he offered, and on which these grave charges are founded. It will there be seen that in the estimation of Mr. Fillmore's party the defence of freedom of Speech is infamous, and that opposition to Slavery Extension and condemnation of Ruffianism, either in the U. S. Senate or in Kansas, are held to be traitorous. In this view of the case we should not be surprised at seeing a very large crop of Traitors in this State next November.

REPUBLICAN DOCUMENTS NOW READY.

LIFE OF COLONEL FREMONT.

An original and authentic Biography of the People's Candidate for President, prepared expressly and with great care for THE TRIBUNE Office, is now ready. It is condensed into a pamphlet of 32 large octavo pages, on good type, with spirited illustrations.

Price per dozen,	$ 0 40
Price per hundred,	2 50
Price per thousand,	20 00

A German Edition of the above is now ready, same price.

HON. CHARLES SUMNER'S SPEECH in the Senate, on Kansas Affairs—32 pages.

Price per dozen,	$ 0 40
Price per hundred,	2 50
Price per thousand,	20 00

BORDER RUFFIAN CODE IN KANSAS is now ready—16 large octavo pages.

Price per dozen,	$ 0 20
Price per hundred,	1 25
Price per thousand,	10 00

THE REPORT OF THE KANSAS INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE;

Submitted on Tuesday, the 1st inst., by the Hon. Messrs. Howard of Mich. and Sherman of Ohio, with 2,500 pages of evidence, the fruit of three months' faithful labor in Kansas.

Price per single copy,	$ 0 04
Price per dozen,	0 40
Price per hundred,	2 50
Price per thousand,	20 00

GOVERNOR SEWARD'S SPEECH on the Immediate Admission of Kansas, is now ready—16 large octavo pages.

Price per dozen,	$ 0 20
Price per hundred,	1 25
Price per thousand,	10 00

HON. SCHUYLER COLFAX'S SPEECH on the "Laws" of Kansas, 16 octavo pages, same price as the above.

JAMES BUCHANAN, HIS DOCTRINES AND POLICY, as exhibited by himself and his friends. 16 octavo pages, same price as above.

TRACT FOR AMERICANS—Embracing the Speech of Hon. E. B. MORGAN, in reference to Millard Fillmore's Political History and Position; also George Law and Chauncey Shaffer's reasons for repudiating Fillmore and Donelson, and the Action of the Know-Nothing State Convention at Syracuse on the Resolutions censuring Brooks's Assault on Senator Sumner, &c. 16 octavo pages, same price as above.

☞ *Orders enclosing the cash are respectfully solicited.*

GREELEY & McELRATH,

TRIBUNE OFFICE, NEW YORK.